



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

P

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,856	03/18/2004	Yoshihiro Ishibe	03500.017990	7722
5514	7590	08/01/2006		EXAMINER
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				PHAM, HAI CHI
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2861

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/802,856	ISHIBE, YOSHIHIRO
	Examiner Hai C. Pham	Art Unit 2861

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-14 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 4 and 11-14 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,3 and 5-10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. The indicated allowability of claim 2, which is now cancelled and whose limitation has been incorporated into the parent claim 1, is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference to Kato (U.S. 6,643,043). Rejections based on the newly cited reference follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishibe (U.S. 6,256,132) in view of Kato (U.S. 6,643,043).

With regard to claim 1, Ishibe, an acknowledged prior art, discloses a multi-beam scanning optical system comprising light source means which has plural luminescence parts arranged apart from each other in both a main-scanning direction and a sub-scanning direction (light source 1 includes two light emissions sections A and B spaced apart in both main and sub-scanning directions) (Figs. 6A, 6B) (col. 5, lines 23-32), a rotating polygon mirror (5) which has reflection surfaces (5a) for deflecting plural light beams emitted from the plural luminescence parts, respectively, a converting optical

system (condensing lens 2) which is arranged in an optical path leading from the light source means to the rotating polygon mirror and converts the plural light beams into convergent light beams or divergent light beams (col. 5, lines 33-36), and a focusing optical system ($f\theta$ lens system 6) which focuses the plural light beams deflected by the rotating polygon mirror onto a surface to be scanned of a drum shape (photosensitive drum 7) having a rotation axis along the main-scanning direction, wherein, in a sub-scanning section, the respective light beams to be made incident on the surface to be scanned are made incident such that principal rays thereof form an angle (angle α) with respect to a normal line of the surface to be scanned, respectively (Fig. 7) (col. 6, lines 39-47), whereby when it is assumed that a maximum value of a positional deviation amount, which is generated in a first direction relatively parallel to the main-scanning direction between focusing points of the respective light beams on the surface to be scanned, is δY_1 (col. 7, lines 41-51), a maximum value of a positional deviation amount, which is generated in a second direction relatively parallel to the main-scanning direction between the focusing points of the respective light beams on the surface to be scanned as convergent light beams or divergent light beams are made incident on the third optical system in the main scanning direction, is δY_2 (col. 7, lines 54-67).

Ishibe teaches the required conditions that bind the two maximum values of the positional deviation amounts δY_1 and δY_2 with respect to the distance P between two adjacent scanning lines, for a printer having a resolution of 600 dpi, such that:

$$|\delta Y_1 + \delta Y_2| < P/3 = 0.01411 \text{ mm} \quad (\text{equations 6 and 8})$$

where $\delta Y_1 = +0.00212 \text{ mm}$

$$\delta Y_2 = -0.00229 \text{ mm}$$

but fails to include the third positional deviation amount δY_3 in the main scanning direction due to the relative wavelength difference between the light emitting sections.

Kato discloses that the imaging position deviation in the main scanning direction caused by a wavelength variation between the multiple laser light sources has to be suppressed to an amount of 50 μm or less in a printer having a resolution of 600 dpi (col. 11, lines 43-54) or

$$\delta Y_3 = 50 \mu\text{m} = 0.050 \text{ mm},$$

the largest positional deviation amount as compared to δY_1 and δY_2 . In other words, the combined positional deviation amount would give:

$$|\delta Y_1 + \delta Y_2 + \delta Y_3| \leq \text{MAX} (|\delta Y_1|, |\delta Y_2|, |\delta Y_3|)$$

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to set the different positional deviation amounts in the device of Ishibe to also account for the positional deviation amount caused by a wavelength variation as taught by Kato. The motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the positional deviations of the different laser beams and thus to reduce the misregistration between colors.

Ishibe also fails to teach the required condition related to the absolute value of the sum of the three positional deviation amounts to be less than 0.014 mm.

Kato further teaches that the wavelength deviation between the plurality of light-emitting portions in the multiple laser beam scanner is permitted by about 5 nm with degrading the quality of the image and that the imaging position deviation caused by the

maximum permissible wavelength deviation of 5 nm could be suppressed to 11 μ m or 0.011 mm in a printer having a resolution of 600 dpi (col. 17, lines 27-35). Therefore, the absolute value of the sum of the three positional deviation amounts becomes:

$$|\delta Y_1 + \delta Y_2 + \delta Y_3| = |(+0.00212) + (-0.00229) + (0.011)| = 0.01083 \text{ mm}$$

which amply satisfies the claimed condition.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to further suppress the imaging position deviation in the main scanning direction caused by a maximum wavelength deviation in the device of Ishibe to a value less than 0.014 mm as taught by Kato for the purpose of correcting aberration and preventing misregistration or image non-uniformity between colors.

With regard to claims 8-10, Ishibe fails to teach the printer controller, which converts code data inputted from an external device into an image signal and inputs the image signal to the multi-beam optical scanning device, the plural image bearing members which are arranged on the surfaces to be scanned of the multi-beam optical scanning devices and the formation of different color images, and the printer controller converting color signals inputted from an external device into image data of different colors and inputting the image data to the respective multi-beam optical scanning device

Kato discloses in Fig. 26 a multi-beam scanning device for forming color images, the device including plural image bearing members, which are arranged on the surfaces to be scanned of the multi-beam optical scanning devices, to form different color

images, a printer controller (153), which converts color code data inputted from an external device (152) into an image signal (col. 5, lines 33-38 and col. 29, lines 39-62).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to provide the multi-beam optical scanning devices to form different color images as well as the code converter to the device of Ishibe as taught by Kato since Kato teaches this to be well known in the art that the plural multi-beam optical scanning devices are needed to form color images and that the printer controller is needed to format the input image data such that the image can be properly formed.

With regard to claims 3 and 5-7, Ishibe further teaches:

- The positional deviations δY_1 and δY_2 having opposite signs, and either one can be negative or positive (col. 10, lines 57-59), and thus the following relationship $\delta Y_1 \times (\delta Y_2 + \delta Y_3) < 0$ is met when δY_1 has a negative sign,
- both the second direction and the third direction are directions opposite to the first direction (by virtue of the teaching at col. 10, lines 57-59),
- an optical system (cylinder lens 4) which focuses the plural light beams, which have passed through the converting optical system (condensing lens 2), on the reflection surfaces of the rotating polygon mirror in a linear shape extending in the main-scanning direction (col. 5, lines 37-45),
- a photosensitive member (photosensitive drum 101) (Fig. 15) arranged on the surface to be scanned, a developing device (107) which develops an electrostatic

latent image, which is formed on the photosensitive member by a light beam used for scanning in the multi-beam optical scanning device, as a toner image, a transfer device (transfer roller 108) which transfers the developed toner image onto a material to have an image transferred thereon, and a fixing device (fixing roller 113) which fixes the transferred toner image to the material to have an image transferred thereon.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 4 and 11-14 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3 and 5-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai C. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-2260. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vip Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2458. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



HAI PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER
July 24, 2006